

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 22, 2005, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 15 and 21 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-13 and 15-25 are pending in the present application, and are respectfully submitted reexamination.

Claim Objection

Claim 21 was objected to as containing some informalities. Claim 21 has been amended to obviate this objection. Thus, the Applicant submits that claim 21 is in compliance with US patent practice.

Claim 15

Claim 15 has been amended to depend from claim 13.

Rejection of Claims 13 and 17-19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 13 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by MacPhail (U.S. Patent No. 5,089,956). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In making the rejection, the Examiner cites column 4, lines 40-43 and notes that "the server library performs various services such as for storing and retrieving documents electronically (column 4, lines 41-42) and thereby the packet identifier must match the library identifier to assure the correct destination of electronic document delivery."

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of MacPhail.

For example, it is submitted that the method of distributing related documents to identified end users in an information processing system of MacPhail is neither comparable nor analogous to the electronic book secure communication system as recited in claim 13 of the present application. In fact, the Applicant submits that the processing system of MacPhail does not operate with “packets” of information. Nowhere does MacPhail disclose or suggest the subject of “packets” of information. Therefore, the Applicant submits that MacPhail fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of “if the packet has a unique packet identifier, determining whether the packet identifier matches a library identifier of the library; and if the packet identifier matches the library identifier, storing the packet to a data file in a library storage” as recited in claim 13.

Moreover, to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single prior art reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, MacPhail fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is not anticipated by the disclosure of MacPhail. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable.

As claims 17-19 depend from claim 13, the Applicant submits that each of these claims incorporates the patentable aspects therein, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claim, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 1-11 and 21-25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-11 and 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartrick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,428,529, hereinafter "Hartrick") in view of Choudhury et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,509,074, hereinafter "Choudhury"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In making the rejection, the Office Action admits that the primary reference of Hartrick "does not disclose expressly using the unique key for data protection," with respect to claim 1, and "does not disclose expressly encrypting and compressing the packet," with respect to claim 21. See, pgs. 6 and 9 of Office Action. The Examiner relies on the secondary reference of Choudhury for allegedly supplementing the deficiencies that exist in Hartrick.

It is respectfully submitted that the present application claims the benefit of priority to U.S. application no. 07/991,074 filed December 9, 1992, and to U.S. application no. 08/160,194, now U.S. patent no. 5,990,927, filed December 2, 1993.

The primary reference of Hartrick was filed as U.S. application no. 546,334 on June 29, 1990, and patented on June 27, 1995.

However, the secondary reference of Choudhury was filed as U.S. application no. 187,580 on January 27, 1994, and patented on April 16, 1996.

Given that the effective filing dates of the present application are December 9, 1992, and December 2, 1993, the subject matter of the present application predates the effective filing date of Choudhury. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Choudhury is **NOT** a valid reference with respect to this rejection.

In view of the above, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1-11 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Hartrick and Choudhury be withdrawn, and submit that claims 1-11 and 21-25 are allowable.

Rejection of Claims 15, 16 and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacPhail in view of Boulton. Furthermore, claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacPhail in view of Feigenbaum (U.S. Patent No. 4,644,470). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacPhail in view of Choudhury. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As claims 15, 16 and 20 depend from claim 13, the Applicant submits that each of these claims incorporates the patentable aspects therein, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the claim 13, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Claim 20 is also traversed because the Applicant has established above that Choudhury is not a valid reference, as the present application claims the benefit of priority to U.S. application no. 07/991,074 filed December 9, 1992, and to U.S. application no. 08/160,194, now U.S. patent no. 5,990,927, filed December 2, 1993, which predate Choudhury.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claim 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartrick in view of Choudhury and in view of Boulton (U.S. Patent No. 4,985,697). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, the secondary reference of Choudhury was filed as U.S. application no. 187,580 on January 27, 1994, and patented on April 16, 1996.

Given that the effective filing dates of the present application are December 9, 1992 and December 2, 1993, the subject matter of the present application predates the effective filing date of Choudhury. As such, we it is respectfully submitted that Choudhury is not a valid reference with respect to that rejection.

Accordingly, claim 12 is allowable, and the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 1-13 and 15-25 and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper,

<This Space is Intentionally Left Blank>

may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Docket No. 026880-00017.

Respectfully submitted,



Sam Huang
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 48,430

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

SH:ksm/lbm